

Appendix G  
Public Hearing Transcript

Correspondence dated after issuance of the EA

JFK Section 100

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Thursday, June 29, 2004

Perry Hall Middle School

4300 Ebenezer Road

Baltimore County, Maryland

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DUERLING:

Good evening, again. Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Keith Duerling, I'm the Director of Engineering for the Maryland Transportation Authority, and I will be the Hearing Officer this evening.

Tonight's hearing is co-sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration, in coordination with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

On behalf of Governor Bob Ehrlich, Chairman and State Transportation Secretary Robert Flannigan, and the Maryland Transportation Authority members, and the co-sponsoring agencies, I would like to welcome you to this public hearing for the I-95 Section 100 Project Planning Study.

The study limits extend from south of the I-895/95 split to north of Route 43 on I-95. Please direct your attention to the brochure that has been prepared for your information. If you have not received one, copies are available from the receptionist.

The brochure is a summary of the information related to this project, and includes descriptions of the proposed improvements, as well as an environmental summary. Please review this brochure to aid in your understanding of tonight's presentation.

At this time, I would like to introduce representatives of the Authority's project team, who will participate in this evening's hearing. To my right is Melissa Williams, the Project Manager for the Transportation Authority, and also here is Mr. Rob Tresselt, representing Mr. Steve Hurtt, the Real Estate Manager for the Transportation

Authority.

The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of these and other members of the project team are listed in the brochure. At this time, I would like to acknowledge elected officials and other officials who are present this evening.

From Baltimore County, we have Craig Forest, who is representing County Executive Smith, and Emory Hines, representing Baltimore County Planning. Also, Delegate Eric Bromwell was here earlier, but had to leave. We have Mark Yost, who is representing Senator Katherine Klausmeier, and we also have Delegate Joseph Butler here.

From the AAA, we have John White present, and from the Maryland Department of Transportation, David Marks, Chief of Staff to Secretary Flannigan. From the Federal Highway Administration, Ivan Marrero, and representing State Highway Administration, Dennis Yoder. Are there any other elected officials who would like to introduce themselves, if I have missed anyone? Thank you.

A formal notice was published in newspapers listed in the brochure, and public service announcements were sent to radio stations serving this area to notify individuals of tonight's hearing, and to encourage participation. In addition to the advertisements, flyers were sent to property owners in the vicinity of the project study area.

Interested groups and individuals who were not already on the mailing list were encouraged to submit their names to the receptionist. Your name will automatically be added to the project mailing list if you are signed in this evening with the receptionist at the front door, or by completing and returning a comment form located in the back of the brochure. This list will be used for notification of any subsequent public

involvement, and for the distribution of project information.

This evening's proceedings are being recorded. The official transcript of this public hearing will become part of the project record. The transcript will be available by September, 2004, for review at the White Marsh Public Library, and at the Rosedale Public Library, as well as at offices of the Maryland Transportation Authority at the Frances Scott Key Bridge.

To confirm its availability, please call the project manager, Ms. Melissa Williams, at the phone number listed in the brochure.

Written comments and material for inclusion in the transcript will be accepted until July 29th, 2004. Written comments may also be submitted on the pre-addressed comment forms provided in the back of the brochure. Additional copies are available at the receptionist's table where you entered tonight's hearing, and at the comment table. These completed forms may be left with the receptionist, or you may add postage and mail the comment form to the Authority.

The purpose of this hearing is to formally present the results of the detailed engineering studies and environmental analyses performed since the November 18, 2003 public workshop, and to provide an opportunity for interested persons to offer written or verbal comments for consideration as part of the public record.

The hearing also gives you the opportunity to discuss issues regarding potential impacts to environmental features and properties within the study area.

The Maryland Transportation Authority, through consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has identified waters of the United States, including jurisdictional wetlands which are regulated by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This public hearing provides the opportunity to present views, opinions, and information

which will be considered by the Corps in evaluating a Section 404 permit which is required for any project that involves impacts to wetlands or other waters within the jurisdiction of the Corps.

All comments received will become part of the formal project record. Written comments related to the Corps Section 404 permit decision may also be submitted to Mr. Richard Kibby, Project Manager, U.S. Corps of Engineers, at the address provided in the brochure, until July 29th, 2004.

The Maryland Transportation Authority's highway development process consists of four phases. The project planning phase, the engineering or final design phase, the right-of-way acquisition phase, and the construction phase. Funding for this project has been programmed for project planning through construction.

This project is currently in the detailed study stage of the project planning phase. During this stage, the location and general engineering design features, along with the environmental impacts and permits are identified.

Project planning activities during this stage also include coordination with other state and federal agencies, and public involvement.

The next phase of highway development is the engineering or final design phase. During this phase, construction drawings will be prepared, and final right-of-way requirements will be determined. The right-of-way acquisition phase usually begins about halfway through the design phase.

Representatives from our right-of-way section are available tonight to answer questions regarding these procedures. As part of this presentation, we will also provide some general information on right-of-way acquisition process.

Construction can only begin after the final design phase is completed,

which includes environmental permits being obtained, and right-of-way being acquired.

At this time, I would like to ask Ms. Melissa Williams, the project manager, to describe the project.

MS. WILLIAMS:

Thank you, Keith. The purpose of this project is to address capacity and safety needs on I-95 Section 100 from the I-895(N) split to north of MD 43, and thereby improve access, mobility, and safety for local, regional, and inter-regional traffic, including passenger, freight, and transit vehicles.

These roadway improvements should reduce diversion to alternate routes, such as the community-oriented arterials US 1, US 40, and MD 7. A traffic analysis was performed to determine existing vehicular traffic volumes, and to develop projected volumes for the year 2025. Future volumes are based on existing travel patterns, traffic volumes, and land uses planned in the region.

Section 100 is the most congested section of I-95 in Maryland, north of Baltimore City. Currently, Section 100, south of MD 43, operates at level of service F during the morning and evening rush hours. If capacity needs are not addressed, congestion is expected to increase by the planning horizon year of 2025. By 2025, Section 100 south of Maryland 43 is also expected to operate at level of service E and F during the weekend peak periods.

Unchecked, increased congestion levels will extend the existing peak hour into a peak period of several hours in duration, and increase the level of diversion to alternate routes, such as the community-oriented arterials, US 1, MD 40, US 40, and MD 7.

The accident rate on Section 100 is currently lower than the statewide

average for comparable urban interstates. However, the total number of accidents on Section 100 is increasing, especially in the vicinity of the urban I-895, I-695, and MD 43 interchanges, where large volumes of merging, diverging, and weaving movements occur.

At some locations, left-hand exits and entrance treatments, limited auxiliary lane length, and restricted sight distance may increase the potential for accidents to occur. The majority of reported accidents in Section 100 are of the type normally identified as congestion-related, such as rear-end and sideswipe.

If the anticipated congestion levels in Section 100 are not addressed, an increase in the number and severity of congestion-related accidents would likely occur.

I will now briefly describe the alternates currently under consideration. These alternates include Alternate 1: The No Build, Alternate 2: General Purpose Lanes, and Alternate 3: Managed lanes. More detailed description of these alternates are available in the brochure. Impacts associated with each alternate are compiled in the environmental summary table, also shown in the brochure.

Alternate 1: The No-Build Alternate would be restricted to normal maintenance and safety improvements. There would be no increase in roadway capacity, or any significant reduction in the accident rate.

Alternate 2: The General Purpose Lanes Alternate includes the provision of additional general purpose lanes to accommodate the projected traffic demand and reach an acceptable weekday and weekend level of service.

This alternate would consist of: Four lanes in each direction of I-95 from approximately 1/4 mile south of the I-895 interchange to the point where I-95 merges with I-895. Six lanes in each direction, between the I-895 north split, and the MD 43



interchange, and north of MD 43, the roadway would transition from six lanes in each direction to the existing four lanes in each direction.

The design of the I-95/I-895(N) split interchange for the general purpose lanes alternate, shown in the brochure, emphasizes I-95 as the through movement in the interchange. Northbound I-895 would cross over the northbound and southbound I-95 roadways, and a third lane on southbound I-895 would be extended to the Moravia Road off-ramp.

The design of the I-95/I-695 interchange also shown in the brochure, would be a fully directional interchange, which would remove the braided mainline roadways on both I-95, and I-695, replacing them with mainline roadway alignments that would remain parallel.

This would improve the interchange geometry, and driver expectancy, by replacing all left-hand entrances and exists with more conventional right-hand entrances and exits.

The design of the I-95/MD 43 interchange, also shown in the brochure, provides a partial cloverleaf interchange. Loop ramps are provided from I-95 northbound to MD 43 westbound and from I-95 southbound to MD 43 eastbound.

All other movements are provided via direct ramps. The direct ramps connect to MD 43 at signalized intersections. There would be no weaving movements within this interchange.

Alternate 3: The Managed Lanes Alternate includes two managed lanes per direction between I-895 and north of MD 43, plus additional general purpose lanes. In order to generally reach a peak hour/peak direction level of service E in the general purpose lanes, and level of service D or better in the managed lanes through the design

year, this alternate would require the following number of lanes per direction:

Four general purpose lanes in each direction of I-95 from approximately 1/4 mile south of the I-895 interchange, to the point where I-95 merges with I-895.

Two managed lanes and four general purpose lanes in each direction between the I-895(N) split, and MD 43.

North of MD 43, the roadway would transition from the six-lane section (two lanes managed, and four lanes general purpose in each direction) into the existing four lanes in each direction.

The managed lanes could operate under a single management strategy 24-hours per day, or on a time-share basis, with different restrictions at different times of the day. Management strategies could include restrictions at access locations by time of day, by vehicle type, by type of use, or by price.

Managed lanes would be designed for flexibility, so that management strategies could be modified over time to maximize person moving capacity, optimize vehicle carrying capacity, and achieve transportation and community goals.

The design of the I-95/I-895(N) split interchange under the managed lanes alternate, as shown in the brochure, is similar to the general purpose lanes alternate. The managed lanes alternate would adjust the configuration of the existing interchange by relocating the southbound roadway of I-95 and the northbound roadway of I-895 to make I-95 the through movement in the interchange, and provide direct access between the managed lanes on I-95 (north of the I-895(n) split), and I-895.

These ramps cross over the I-95 southbound general purpose lanes. The managed lane ramp to southbound I-895 forms a third lane. One of the two southbound general purpose lanes is dropped in the vicinity of Moravia Road to tie into the existing

two lane southbound I-895 roadway.

The design of the I-95/I-695 interchange, shown in the brochure, eliminates the existing braided roadways on both I-95, and I-695. Driver expectancy would be further improved by eliminating all left-hand entrance and exit ramps from the higher volume general purpose lanes. A few left-hand access points would still remain, but would only be located on the low volume managed lane ramps. Five roadway tiers or levels are needed for this alternate.

The design of the I-95/MD 43 interchange, shown in the brochure, would include a single exit point on each approach, with direct connections provided for all interchange movements. All weaving within the interchange would be eliminated under this option.

Single lane ramps would provide for all movements to and from managed lanes, with the lanes connecting directly to MD 43 at a signalized intersection on the structure over I-95.

This concludes the description of alternates. I will now present the environmental overview of the project.

The environmental impacts associated with each alternate are included in the summary of impacts and costs table located in the brochure.

The study area is dominated by residential land use from the I-95/I-895(N) split, to the I-695 interchange. North of the I-695 interchange, the study area is dominated by a mix of forested, residential, and commercial land uses, with some sparsely scattered areas of open space and industrial land use. Future land use is projected to remain similar to existing land use, in that future development will consist mainly of re-urbanization and renewal of older neighborhoods.

No business displacements are anticipated with either build alternate. However, residential displacements are anticipated to occur with both build alternates. Alternate 2 - general purpose lanes, could displace six residential structures, and seven outbuildings, and could require acquisition of approximately 68.5 acres of land. Alternate 3 - managed lanes, could displace seven residential structures and 12 outbuildings, and could require the acquisition of approximately 97.7 acres of land, as seen in table 2 of the brochure.

No disproportionately high and adverse effect on low-income, minority, elderly, or handicapped populations have been identified.

The Maryland Transportation Authority, in consultation with the Maryland Historical Trust, and other interested parties, has determined that there is one historic standing structure eligible for the National Register of Historic Places within the project area. No adverse effect to this property is anticipated from any of the proposed alternates.

A single prehistoric archeological site is potentially eligible for the National Register. It would not be impacted by Alternates 1 or 2, but could be impacted by Alternate 3.

The 100-year flood plain associated with Moores Run, Redhouse Creek, Stemmers Run, White Marsh Run, Honeygo Run, and Lower Gunpowder and its tributaries could be impacted as a result of the build alternates. Flood plain impacts would be 39.4 acres, and 44.9 acres, for Alternates 2 and 3, respectively.

Stream impacts range from approximately 11,000 to 16,000 linear feet, and wetland impacts range from approximately 5 acres to 6 acres for Alternates 2 and 3. Woodland impacts are estimated to range from approximately 150 to 210 acres for build

Alternates 2 and 3, respectively.

Stormwater management and sediment and erosion control plans to minimize impacts to water quality will be prepared and implemented in accordance with the Maryland Department of Environment regulations.

Twenty-three noise sensitive areas were identified for this project. The projected 2025 design-year noise levels indicate that the Federal Highway Administration Noise Abatement Criteria of 67 decibels is approached or exceeded at 18 of the 23 NSA's associated with the build alternates. Nine noise sensitive areas for Alternate 2 meet the reasonableness criteria for consideration of a sound barrier, while eight noise sensitive areas meet the criteria for Alternate 3.

The air quality analysis conducted for the Section 100 alternates indicates that none of the proposed build alternates would exceed national ambient air quality standards for the 1-hour or the 8-hour carbon monoxide concentration in the 2025 design year.

This concludes the environmental overview. Please refer to the brochure for any additional information. Mr. Rob Tresselt will now describe the procedures by which private property is acquired for highway projects. Rob?

MR. TRESSELT:

Thank you, Melissa. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Steve Hurtt, the Authority's Real Estate Manager, will manage any future property acquisition associated with this project.

The procedures for acquiring right-of-way by the Maryland Transportation Authority differ somewhat from the normal real estate transactions between individuals. The Maryland Transportation Authority will secure at least one appraisal on each affected

property, and offer the owners the amount determined by the Maryland Transportation Authority to be just compensation for the property rights to be acquired.

Each property owner will be provided an opportunity to accompany the appraiser when the property is inspected. After just compensation is established, the right-of-way agent will meet with each property owner to discuss the acquisition, and how the construction will affect the individual properties. At that time, the agent will explain the offer, and answer any questions that the affected property owners may have.

If the state and the property owner cannot reach an agreement through negotiations, the rights of the property owner will be protected by acquiring the property rights through the eminent domain process. This process provides the means for the property owner's point of view to be heard, and permits the amount of just compensation be established by either a board of property review, a judge, or a jury, based on the testimony given on behalf of both the owner and the state.

We wish to assure you that we will make every effort possible to obtain the necessary rights of way on a friendly and reasonable basis.

In addition to the amount paid for the property, the state's relocation assistance program will provide advisory assistance, and may provide certain monetary payments to tenants, homeowners, and businesses that must be relocated. Additional allowances may be paid for moving expenses, looking for a replacement business site, and in some cases, payment to businesses in lieu of moving expenses.

Each case will be analyzed, and the relocation assistance officer assigned to the project will inform the affected property owners of their eligibilities.

The program assures that no person will be relocated from their residence without a 90-day notice, or until a comparable or adequate dwelling is available. All

replacement housing will be fair housing, open to all affected persons, regardless of race, color, sex, or national origin, and will be within their financial means, and will be reasonably accessible to their place of employment, public services, and other conveniences.

The relocation assistance officer is available to assist all affected families and businesses to find satisfactory replacement housing and business sites.

Detailed right-of-way information for each alternative is shown in the summary of impacts found in the table and the brochure. I will be available following this hearing to answer any specific questions that you may have regarding the proposed acquisition of properties for this particular project.

If at a later date, questions arise, please feel free to contact Mr. Steve Hurtt. His address and phone number may be found in the brochure. Mr. Keith Duerling will now summarize Maryland Transportation Authority's equal opportunity program.

MR. DUERLING:

Thank you, Rob. The Authority's Chief of Equal Opportunity and Diversity Programs is Mr. Louis Jones, but he was unable to be here this evening.

By virtue of federal approval requirements on interstate access points for the highway, we are working in partnership with Federal Highway Administration to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by Executive Order 12898.

Title VI prohibits the intentional discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin, in any program receiving federal financial assistance.

Supplemental legislation also prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, age, religion, and physical or mental disability. Environmental Justice Executive Order

12898 requires federal agencies to identify and address this proportionally high and adverse human health or environmental affects of their programs and activities on minority populations, or low income populations.

An important objective of this order is to encourage minority and low income populations to participate in the planning process. In light of these requirements, we intend to take all actions necessary to assure that the project complies with all of these applicable requirements of Title VI and Executive Order 12898.

If you have any questions concerning Title VI or Executive Order 12898 as they relate to this project, please contact Louis Jones. The phone number is 410-537-1053, or by internet at [ljones@mdta.state.md.us](mailto:ljones@mdta.state.md.us)

This concludes our formal presentation. We would now like to receive your comments. We are sincerely interested in hearing your views regarding the project, either as an individual, or as a representative of an organization or community association.

For those of you who prefer to submit written comments, forms for this purpose are available for your use in the back of the brochure. Comments can also be e-mailed through the project's website located at [www.mdtransportationauthority.com](http://www.mdtransportationauthority.com)

Please remember that we are recording this hearing, so when making comments, please speak directly into the microphone in the center aisle, giving your full name and address, and any organization that you represent. Please try to limit your testimony to five minutes or less, so that others have an opportunity offer their views.

You may also give testimony privately to the court reporter here tonight to my right. At this time, I would like to invite any elected officials who would like to speak. Okay. Then I would now like to begin to allow those who are registered to speak.



The Section 100 project team will respond to all comments in letter format following the hearing. At this time, I would like to invite Anselm Salins, is that name correct, please, to the microphone. If you would, just please state your name and address again for the record, please.

MR. SALINS:

My name is Anselm Salins, I'm speaking on behalf of my wife. Thank you, Melissa. Just taking a few notes here.

I think one of the things that - - did you need my address? We live on Rossville Boulevard, just next to the bridge. Like us, I'm sure there are many people living right across 95, it is a great big project.

I think one of the things all of those people as we grow as a community, as Melissa brought up, I think Rossville Boulevard was somehow missed there. It is a very, very vital link between Bel Air Road right past the 43. You've got the college, you've got the hospital, you've got three churches, God bless them, and also we've got residents.

I think if there is a table, and on the table, on the dining table my mom would be able to put like ten dishes. I'm sure if there were 25 dishes, she would not be able to fit it on that table. I think there is a point in this. The point is as we seek growth, I think it should be common sense growth, and I believe that is the purpose of our hearing here. Common sense growth in the sense that Rossville Boulevard, you've got six lanes from the college, and there is another church there, but 5,000 students right at the college.

You've got Franklin Square Hospital, and it comes down to two lanes over our bridge. Next to the bridge is a very sharp turn, and that is where we live. My wife has been having daycare for the last 14 years, and we are so afraid to make that grow,

because we've had three accidents right across our driveway because of the sharp turn there.

I think with me, and I know I've got five minutes here, but I think with me, six lanes down on the other end, we've got five lanes, and you might think it has nothing to do with 95, but I think it does. We just spoke of access road 43, and other roads.

As we grow as a community, whether it is Rossville Boulevard and other places, I think there should be a place on the table, so to speak, and that is our concern. Two weeks ago, we had a very serious accident right on 95 overpass, and it blocked that road. There have been schools of accidents right on that turn.

I spoke with Mr. Forrest, and God bless him in his job, I'm sure he has got tons of things to do. People are in authority to make sure things are happening, and I think the question is priority. When does it become a priority? Six lanes down, five lanes down, and in those six and five lanes, they have given out permits for 320 homes to be built.

Right now, we are expanding 95 and 43, and all of those things. Common sense tells me there is no place on the table. I think coordination between this beautiful project, and coordination between the regular county, zoning, and all those people. Like Montgomery County, I travel a lot to Montgomery County. They are very tight as far as their growth goes.

I think my comment is I think representing a lot of people here. When do we make it a priority in the county to get involved, and basically work together giving out permits and not really seeing that their are accesses that will overburden this place. Is that going to become a priority when someone is actually killed? There has already been at least one fatality. So that's my comment. God bless your work, and we really

appreciate this hearing, but the thing is, as we grow, let us grow sensibly. I think that's my comment. Thank you.

MR. DUERLING:

Thank you very much for your comment, Mr. Salins. I have no other people registered to give comments this evening. We have time, if there is anyone else in the audience that would like to give some testimony. Sir, if you'd like to step up. Give us your name, address, and any affiliation that you have.

MR. ROTHE:

Good evening, everyone. My name is Bill Rothe, R-O-T-H-E. I live at 3399 Park Falls Drive in Nottingham, 21236. I guess I represent myself.

I think in looking at your projects, the one problem I see with that part of 95 is the constant lane switching that you do not get at all the other parts of 95. At that part, you've got 895 coming in a left-hand lane. 95 comes in lanes three, four, and five. Lane five disintegrates about a half mile up the road, so those people are trying to squeeze in and out of lane four.

The people in lane four are trying to squeeze over into lane three. A mile up the road, the people in lane one see Towson only. Uh-oh, I'm from New Jersey. They are trying to move out of lane one into lane two, and over to lane three. Someone in lane three says oh, gee, I've got to get off at Towson, and they're trying to go from lane three to lane two, to lane one.

Someone in lane two says, oh, I've got to get to Golden Ring, they're trying to get from two to three to four to five, uh-oh, five is going down, now I'm moving back into four. We've all experienced this, every single one of us. That's your problem. It's not the volume of traffic.

The volume of traffic is caused when someone going from lane one to get to lane four ends up in five, tries to get back into four, and there is your accident. Now everything stops. Southbound, same thing. You have people coming onto 95 there at 695, you're in lane I think it is six, if I'm not mistaken. Then you move over to lane five, then you get halfway down and say uh-oh, I want the Harbor Tunnel, because they just said 95 is backed up, use the Harbor Tunnel.

I'm in lane five, I've got to get to lane one. All right, oh everybody else is - - no, this guy wants to come over because he wants to get off at - - no, he's moving here. Boom, bad accident at King Avenue, 95 is jammed up; the Harbor Tunnel is jammed up. Use the Key Bridge. Someone at Kenwood is saying, how the hell do I get from southbound 95 back to 695 to use the Key Bridge?

See our problems? Now, you are talking about bridges. We all remember the horrific tanker fire at 895 and 95 northbound, where the tanker went over a bridge. There was another horrific tanker fire when a tanker tried to make the turn from 695 to go northbound on 83, and wiped out underneath the bridge there at northbound 83.

The problem with bridges are there are too many places for something to happen, and bridges freeze before roadways. If you're on the fifth tier of a bridge trying to get from 95 over to 695 to Towson and you are slipping and sliding because you are the highest part at 15 degrees with two inches of sand or salt or ice or slush up there, you're not going to want to get up there.

Your managed lanes are good, except if you can't get into them, they're no good to us. If I'm in them and there is an accident, boom, the managed lanes stop. Now, how do you get in there to get the people out? You've got to go to the far end of the managed lane and come back in, it is like the tunnel.

Looking at your projects, the second one over here seems to be the most reasonable one, getting as many lanes as you can. If you want the exclusive alternative to this, light rail from White Marsh. Metro from White Marsh. A lot of people are using 95 because that is the only way they know to get into the city.

When you get into the city, where the hell do you park? I guess that's my basic comments. I mean, seriously, the only real way you're going to be able to alleviate a problem, don't build managed lanes, because people are not going to use them. You're going to get people in there from out of state that are going to go, what are we going to do now, we're stuck.

Now we've got to pay. Oh, I don't have EZ pass, what am I going to do? They are going to be trying to move, and move, and move. Your problem on that part of 95 is car movement, vehicular movement sideways, not north and south, but east and west. That is where your trouble is.

MR. DUERLING:

Thank you very much, Mr. Rothe. I have another person that is registered to speak. Ms. Lucy Smith. Are you here? Ms. Smith, if you would give us your address and any affiliation, please, I'd appreciate it.

MS. SMITH:

Lucy Smith, the address is 5905 Trumps Mill Road. Two points of interest basically that are of concern to me after tonight's address from the Maryland Transportation Authority.

The first is the amount of money that it is going to take to complete this project, \$400 to potentially \$100 million taxpayer dollars is the numbers that I've heard flying around. Maybe I need clarification, but those are the numbers that are on the news

that are coming from other sources as well.

When I hear those figures, to complete either of these options, the general purpose lanes or the managed lanes, I would like to be assured that being a displaced person, I am losing my home for a project that is going to aspire to have an optimal grade level or movement of traffic at an A, not a D or better. That's discouraging and disheartening to know that if we're at an - - potentially facing an F grade for the movement of traffic in these areas to get to a D, as a teacher, I have to say that's not great strides. It is a little better, but it is not great.

If all of these hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars are going to be spent on this project, these commuters who use these routes every day should be looking forward to an optimal A flow of traffic. D is just very disheartening.

The other comment is on the HOV and our managed lanes that have been discussed. As a commuter, these could be very potentially viable for everyday commuters. But again, being a taxpayer and knowing that a large amount of my money is going into this beginning project now if I want to drive on the HOV, I've got to pay to get on that. Where does the money from the taxpayer end for the State of Maryland to reach their optimal level of traffic flow for anybody? Those are my two points. Thank you.

MR. DUERLING:

Does anyone else wish to speak? If not, then let the record show that no further comments have been offered.

As mentioned earlier, we will hold the formal record open until July 29th, 2004 for your written comments. Thank you for attending tonight's hearing. We appreciate the interest you have shown in the project. The hearing is now adjourned.

Have a good evening, and a safe drive home.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)



## APPENDIX B:

### June 29, 2004 Public Hearing Citizen Comment Summary

According to the sign in log filled out by each attendee upon entrance to the June 29, 2004 Public Hearing held at Perry Hall Middle School, **99** people were in attendance. Of the 99 people, 3 citizens gave public testimony, which was recorded by a court reporter. **41** citizens commented on the Section 100 project after the Public Hearing. This includes comment cards received at the hearing or sent in to the Authority, letters and emails sent to the Authority, and phone calls made to the Authority.

#### **The following is a summary of the citizen input:**

- 7 commenting citizens noted support for Alternate 1: No-Build.
- 2 commenting citizens noted support for Alternate 2: General Purpose Lanes.
- 4 commenting citizens noted support for Alternate 3: Managed Lanes.
- 11 commenting citizens noted concern about noise issues.
  - Of those 11 citizens, 2 preferred vegetative buffers instead of noisewalls.
- 6 commenting citizens noted support for new transit initiatives.
- 4 commenting citizens noted concern about safety.
- 4 commenting citizens complimented the Public Hearing format, content and staff efforts to involve the community in the decision making process.





Deiter	Parkville, MD 21234 410-668-6438		on White Marsh Road. Would like a larger study area map sent to him.		
10 William Dewald	1828 Willann Rd.	Telephone	Is concerned about SWM on his property.	yes	-
11 Ron Forrester	6203 Commons Road Rosedale, MD 21237 410-365-5396	telephone	Concerned about moving noise walls and concern about local impacts to properties. Plans to coordinate with neighborhood. Suggests adding a comment card to newsletter.	no	-
12 Bernie Frist	5407 Bush St. 410-235-1288	Recorded by Walt Kulis	Supports Managed Lanes, specifically HOV. Concerned about noise levels at his property.	no	7/23/04
13 Payson Getz	401 E. Courtland Place Bel Air, MD 21014 paygetz@aol.com	email	Wants info. on widening from I-895 to Harford Co. specifically info. on I-95 over I-695. If this overpass is not done, waste of money.	no	7/6/04
14 John Gregory	5305 Palomino St. White Marsh, MD 21162	comment card	Concerned about noise and wants more information on noise wall plans and schedule in his area (Forge Acres).	yes	7/16/04
15 Jeffrey Griffin	1317 Salonica Place Bel Air, MD 21014 Jjgriff1978@yahoo.com	comment card	Wants more information on whether car pooling lanes were discussed. Supports more transit in the corridor.	yes	7/16/04
16 Russell F. Hassell, Jr.	1822 Willann Road Baltimore, MD 21237	sent card	Supports Alternate 1. Concerned about noise and impacts to Baltimore County.	yes	
17 Jesse J. Hinson	5042 Brightleaf Court Baltimore, MD 21237 410-933-8203	telephone	Would like noise walls along property, condo. unit along I-95. Unable to attend hearing, would like copy of hearing brochure.	yes	7/23/04
18 Cathy Kiselewich		Telephone	Supports Alternate 1.	No	-
19 Judy London	27 Montauk Ct Baltimore, MD 21234	comment card	Wants to be added to the mailing list.	yes	7/16/04

DRAFT



20	John D. Malinowski	44 Woodhollow Court Owings Mills, MD 21117	comment card	Concerned about aesthetics and geometric design of I-695 interchange.	yes	
21	Chuck Marks	4627 E. Joppa Road Perry Hall, MD 21128	comment card	Commends Gov. Ehrlich's transportation initiative.	no	7/16/04
22	Steve Martin	5423 E. Joppa Road Perry Hall, MD 21128	comment card	Comment on mapping at hearing not including new Williams Field development. Concerned about noise levels and decrease in property value.	yes	7/23/04
23	William Martin	443-695-0878	telephone and card at hearing	Re: possible acquisition of his property on Cowenton Ave.	no	-
24	Barker B. Much	PO Box 16721 Essex, MD 21221	letter	Supports Alternate 2. Opposes Managed Lanes. Concerned about effect Section 100 project may have on Ft. McHenry and Harbor tunnel traffic. Concerned about lack of police enforcement along I-95. Thinks transit should be promoted in area.	no	
25	Brandon Prichard	1823 Willann Road Baltimore, MD 21237	comment card	Supports No-Build Alternate. Opposes Managed Lanes Alternate. Concerned about insects and diseases that may be brought into the area due to the potential drainage basin across from his property. Supports transit in corridor.	yes	
26	Helena Prichard	1823 Willann Road Baltimore, MD 21237	comment card	Does not think managed lanes should be tolled. Supports No-Build Alternate. Concerned about freezing of ramp structures. Concerned about drainage near her property. Concerned about adjustment of noise walls. Supports extension of light rail in corridor.	no	

DRAFT



27	Susan Reid	8013 Babikow Road Baltimore, MD 21237 slueya@comcast.net	webform	Could not attend hearing, would like copy of minutes from hearing.	no	7/26/04
28	Arlene Roth	5003 King Ave.	Recorded by Walt Kulis	Prefers Alternate 1. Supports limiting impact to her property.	no	
29	Carol Rowell	9 Weyburn Court Baltimore, MD 21237 Cbrow38@yahoo.com	comment card	Concerned about adjustment to noise wall. Supports extension of light rail in corridor. Appreciative of public involvement efforts.	no	
30	Anselm & Shalin Salins	7410 Rossville Blvd. Rosedale, MD 21237	comment card	Concerned about accidents and safety on Rossville Blvd.	no	
31	Dave Scarpino	580 1/2 East Ave. Baltimore, MD 21206	Recorded by Keith Quintrell	Add to mailing list.	yes	7/16/04
32	Adam Schadt	59 Perryfalls Pl Nottingham, MD 21236	Letter in regards to Northeast Booster article	Supports Alternate 2 and reducing traffic. Not clear on funding practices of the Authority.	no	7/23/04
29	Norma Secoura	410-767-8361	telephone	Positive feedback re: public hearing presentation and displays.	no	-
30	Bernadine Seymour	For South Perry Hall Blvd. Improvement Assoc. 7719 Babikow Road Baltimore, MD 21237	comment card	Concerned that improvement will decrease safety. Not clear on funding practices of the Authority.	no	7/23/04
31	Luci Smith	5905 Trumps Mill Road Baltimore, MD 21206	comment card	Needs further explanation of LOS. Concerned that improvements are not worth cost and taking of her home.	no	
32	Spencer Sullivan	5056 Brightleaf Court Baltimore, MD 21237 spensul@aol.com	comment card	Concerned about noise at Devonshire II Complex. Prefers natural vegetation to noise walls.	yes	
34	Paul and Susan Thompkins	5903 Sandy Springs Road	telephone	Question if Mullen property, behind her residence, will be impacted. Wants to know if her property is eligible for a noise wall.	no	7/22/04
35	Dorothy Wells	4104 Baker Lane Baltimore, MD 21236	Recorded by Keith Quintrell	Supports transit in corridor.	no	7/16/04

DRAFT



36	John White	C/o AAA 100 West Road Suite 304 Towson, MD 21204	comment card by Melissa Williams	Supports Alternate 3: Managed Lanes, specifically Express Toll Lanes.	no	7/23/04
37	Resident		Recorded by Walt Kulis	Supports Alternate 1. Concerned about stormwater pond opposite Hazelwood Ave. bringing insects.	no	-
38	Resident	Devonshire Condominiums	Recorded by Walt Kulis	Concerned about noise levels at Devonshire Condos. Would prefer a berm instead of a wall.	no	-
39	Resident	Devonshire Condominiums	Recorded by Walt Kulis	Does not support tolling of managed lanes. Concern for noise at Devonshire Condos, would like noise wall.	no	-
40	Resident	Baltimore, MD 21236	comment card	Would like to see transit enhancements in corridor. Did not know about focus group.	no	-
41	Frank	Citizen	Telephone	Does not want interchange at I-95 & Cowenton	no	MRW spoke with on 7/20/04

COLOR KEY:

Support Alternate 1: No-Build = 7  
Support Alternate 2: General Purpose Lanes = 2  
Support Alternate 3: Managed Lanes = 4  
Concerns about Noise = 11  
Prefer vegetation instead of noisewall = 2  
Support transit initiatives = 6  
Concerned about Safety = 4  
Compliment Hearing & Public Involvement Efforts = 4

DRAFT